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Reviewer's report:

The following issues are for authors to address in revision:

Main issue: The introduction is long but does not establish the rationale for this study. How is this study different from others? What is the contribution?

The data collection and measurement of variables are not clear.

The discussion section needs to be revised. A comparison with prior findings for all the sig variable results should be presented. What are the implications for practitioners?

Minor issues:

Abstract: Line 45-46: “Outcome analysis considered cluster-adjustment” is confusing. This sentence should be stated earlier.

Results: Line 48-52: Be consistent: include the CI. Also, the AORs and CI should be inserted for the covariates

Line 56: what is “future in-depth analyses”? be specific. Do you mean qualitative study?

Line 58: Statement “Modelling of interventional approaches should consider…” is confusing?

Line 75: “Variation between centres seems to be pronounced…” which centers? What is the variation? It is hard to follow.

Line 84-85: The sentence is out of order

Methods

Line 119: what is random selection implemented? Provide more details..

Line 144-164: The introduction of measurement of the variables is not clear. It needs to be arranged in sections, like outcome variable, covariates (resident characteristics, facility characteristic). If is binary, please specify. Currently, it is not clear.

Lines 165-171, Lines 201-205: Not sure all those lines should be provided. They can be more concise at least.

Line 215: Should it be “Prevalence of physical restraints”?
Line 228 is confusing. The whole section needs to be revised. Please separate the results for resident and facility variables. Present the crude odds ratio, then the AOR...

Discussion
Line 261-262: The sentence “Chairs and wheelchairs..” is confusing.
Line 289: I doubt that 20 is a large number?
Line 298-300: I do not think cognition variable is a sig limitation. There are other variables the study did not include either.

Conclusion
It needs to be consolidated. Currently it reads more like discussion.

Table 1: is it necessary?
Table 2: what is the second column? Is it sample size and %?
Table 4: It is hard to read. Why resident per caregiver FTE not included in the multivariate analysis because its p=0.025?
It would be better if the first column is Crude Odds Ratio, the second column Adjusted Odds Ratio.
Insert a subheading in the row: Resident characteristics, Facility characteristics

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests